

REMARKS

The undersigned thanks Examiner Galen L. Barefoot for the telephonic interview held on December 5, 2006. During the interview, claims 1, 39, and 40 were discussed. In particular, the Examiner stated as to claim 1 that the amendment to claim 1 presented in the response to the prior office action may be further amended to claim that the remote baggage handling system is located remote from the airport terminal. With respect to claims 39 and 40, the Examiner stated that the “double door” suggests a French door; the Examiner suggested that the claims be amended to define separate doorways leading to the two different types of cabins (e.g., first class and general class).

Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments presented above and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1, 3-29, and 39-40 are in the case. Claims 1, 39, and 40 are currently amended. No new matter has been added to any of the currently amended claims.

The proposed amendment to the specification aims to correct certain typographical errors noted during a review of the specification. The proposed amendment does not introduce any new matter.

A. Claim Rejections

1. Claims 1, 4-29, and 39-40

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,730,359) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and as elaborated upon by the Examiner in page 2 of the Office Action.

2. Claim 3

The Examiner also rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and further in view of Hussein (5,600,303). The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with security as taught by Hussein because it provides protection to customers.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

B. Argument

1. Claims 1, 4-29, and 39-40

The rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the Examiner interview held on December 5th, claim 1 is currently amended to further define that the remote baggage handling system is remotely located from and transfers baggage to and from the airport terminal. Support for the amendment can be found in Fig. 24A and the accompanying description therefor in the specification. As discussed in the specification and during the Examiner interview, applicants' baggage handling system is remotely located from the airport terminal in order to increase airport safety. See, e.g., paragraph 128 of the specification.

Also, as discussed during the Examiner interview, claim 39 is currently amended to recite the aircraft as having a jetway having two doorways. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification. See, also, Fig. 21. Claim 40 is currently amended to recite that the jetway of claim 39 includes a first class and a non-first class (e.g., a second class or general class) corridors. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification.

During the Examiner interview, the Examiner intimated that the amendments set forth above should further define applicants' invention. Applicants believe that independent claims 1 and 39, as amended, are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed. For the same reasons, claims 4-29 and 40, which depend from claims 1 and 39 respectively also are patentable and should be allowed.

2. Claim 3

The rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and Szendrodi as set forth above and further in view of Husseiny (5,600,303) is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all of the limitations of claim 1. There is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in such a way to arrive at the invention claimed by the applicants. As stated above, scanning baggage at a location remote from the airport terminal for weapons, explosives, or other unpermitted objects increases airport safety. Applicants believe that claim 3 is patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

C. Conclusion

In view of the amendments and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50-3195.

Application No. 10/711,610
Docket No. 02-0333A

December 7, 2006
Page 17 of 17

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: New York, New York
December 7, 2006

OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY
& BROITMAN P.C.
Customer No. 64722

By: /Andres N. Madrid/
Andres N. Madrid
Registration No. 40,710

250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, New York 10177-0899
Telephone: (212) 681-0600
Fax: (212) 681-0300